

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)

030010

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on _____

Signature _____

Typed or printed name _____

Application Number

10/752,420

Filed

2004-01-05

First Named Inventor

Gregory Gordon ROSE

Art Unit

2432

Examiner

Cordelia P. K. ZECHER

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.

/Won Tae Kim/

Signature

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)

Won Tae Kim

Typed or printed name

☐ attorney or agent of record.

Registration number _____

858-651-6295

Telephone number

☒ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 40,457

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.

Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.

☐ *Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appln. No.: 10/752,420

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8(a))
ELECTRONIC FILING

Applicants: Gregory Gordon Rose, et al.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office:

Filed: January 5, 2004

Examiner: Cordelia P. K. Zecher

Depositor's Name: Cindy McClure
(type or print name)

Art Unit: 2432

Date: October 28, 2011

Customer No. 23696

Signature: /Cindy McClure/

Confirm. No.: 3858

Docket No.: 030010

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF

Filed via EFS

Mail Stop AF

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Commissioner:

This Pre-Appeal Brief is filed in response to the Examiner's remarks in the Final Office Action mailed August 3, 2011. This Pre-Appeal Brief is being submitted in accordance with the requirements of the Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Pilot Program (*see* 1296 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 67, July 12, 2005) and is being submitted concurrently with a Notice of Appeal.

DISPOSITION OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-3, 5-24, 26-28, 50, 51 and 53-68 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5-24, 26-28, 50, 51 and 53-68 stand rejected (see, Final Action mailed August 3, 2011).

Applicants submit that there are clear errors in the rejections of the pending claims and the current rejections rely on modifications to the prior art references that are expressly contrary to the teachings in the prior art.

The current rejections of record are as follows:

Claims 50 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,782,103 (hereinafter “Arthan et al.”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0071561 (hereinafter “Kurn et al.”).

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-14, 16-24, 26-28, 51 and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Arthan et al. in view of Kurn et al., and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0018570 (hereinafter “Hansmann et al.”).

REMARKS

In rejecting each of the independent claims, the Final Office Action relies primarily on Arthan et al. However, because Arthan et al. does not include any disclosure of a single device including all the features of the various independent claims, the Final Office Action imports two substantial modifications into the teachings of Arthan et al. to justify the rejections. First, the Final Office Action asserts that it is obvious to modify Arthan et al. such that the distinct central system 5 is combined into the distinct source system 1 as one of the distributed nodes of the source system 1. This still fails to describe a single device (e.g., a mobile user device) that includes all the features recited in the independent claims. Thus, the Final Office Action relies on a second major modification to the already modified disclosure of Arthan et al. by combining all of the individual nodes of the source system 1, including the central system 5, into a single device.

Although the Final Office Action does not expressly identify any motivation for the proposed modifications to Arthan et al., the Final Office Action refers generally to the Office Action issued on March 24, 2011 in justifying the proposed modification. In particular, the

Office Action issued on March 24, 2011 argues that a modification decreasing the pieces of hardware (e.g., having one piece of hardware perform the task previously performed by two) is analogous to making functions, structures, or actions integral, and that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the central system 5 integral with the source system 1. *See Office Action of March 24, 2011* at p. 3. However, such modifications are patentable where the recited claims show insight that was contrary to the understanding and expectations of the art. *See MPEP* § 2144.04(V)(B); and *Schenck v. Nortron Corp.*, 713 F.2d 782, 218 USPQ 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In the present case, the current claims show insight that is contrary to the understanding and expectations of Arthan et al.

Arthan et al. discloses only a single embodiment. According to that single embodiment, Arthan et al. states that it is “assumed that the example system is such that operators 3 of the source system 1 **are not authorized to handle the private key DSPR itself.**” *Arthan et al.* at col. 2, lines 35-38 (emphasis added). Arthan et al. also teaches that the management of all keys is under control of a security officer 6, who can operate the central system 5 and who uses automated or manual procedures and protocols to arrange for delivery and installation of key material. *Id.* at col. 1, lines 46-50; col. 3, lines 25-43. Arthan et al. further discloses that “the security officer can change to the version of DSPR corresponding to the spare DSPU key” (*Id.* at col. 5, lines 7-10). Thus, Arthan et al. discloses that the security officer 6 is authorized to handle private keys (DSPR) generated by the central system 5 in order to manually deliver and install the keys, as well as to change the version of the private keys, while operators 3 of the source system 1 are prohibited from handling the private keys. Since the operators 3 of the source system 1 are expressly not authorized to handle the private keys, and the security officer 6 is expressly authorized to handle the private keys, the security officer 6 cannot be an operator 3 of the source system 1. Combining the central system 5 with the source system 1 such that the user of the integrated device may both operate the device and manage keys was therefore expressly contrary to the understanding and expectations of Arthan et al.

It is noteworthy that Arthan et al. discloses only one embodiment, in which the operators 3 of the source system 1 are not authorized to handle the private keys. Although the Final Office Action argues that this is just one example, there is no other example and nothing in Arthan et al. that discloses or suggests that the operators can be authorized to handle the private keys in other

examples. Therefore, considering the disclosure of Arthan et al. as a whole, a person of ordinary skill in the art is taught only that the operators 3 of the source system 1 cannot handle the private keys, and could not also be a security officer 6.

Because the combination of the source system 1 and the central system 5 into a single device is not supported by Arthan et al., and such a modification is explicitly contrary to the understanding and expectations of Arthan et al., the proposed modifications cannot be used to justify a rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 14, 19, 22, 26, 50 and 51.

Considering the disclosure according to what is reasonably and fairly taught (e.g., without the modifications proposed by the Final Office Action), Arthan et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the features recited in the independent claims, and the additionally cited references fail to remedy the deficiencies of Arthan et al. For example, details relating to the deficiencies of each of the central system 5, the source system 1 and the destination system 2 can be found in the Response filed by Applicants on June 22, 2011 at pages 21-23, 27 and 31. In general, these portions of the previously filed response set forth the fact that the central system 5 outputs the private key for use by the source system 1 for authentication prior to using the stored spare private key. In addition, the central system 5, which generates the first and second key pairs, does not actually use any of the keys for authentication of the central system 5. These features are contrary to at least some of the features recited by the independent claims. In relation to the source system 1 and the destination system 2, Arthan et al. discloses that the source system 1 simply receives the active private key from the central system 5 and stores the private key into a volatile memory for use, while the destination system 2 simply receives the public key from the central system 5. Neither system generates any keys or outputs any keys.

Therefore, Applicants submit that there is no justification for citing Arthan et al. as teaching the features relating to creating first and second private and public keys, outputting the second private key while retaining the first private key, transmitting the first and second public keys, and using the first private key for authentication.

Although additional reasons exist for dismissing the asserted modification of Arthan et al., Applicants believe that the above described errors are adequate to justify reversal of the Final Office Action.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the rejections asserted in the Final Office Action are based on an erroneous modification of the primary reference. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims on the above-identified grounds be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 28, 2011

By: /Won Tae C. Kim/
Won Tae C. Kim, Reg. # 40,457
(858) 651 6295

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502